

## **REMARKS**

### **Status of the Claims**

Claims 2-7 are now present in this application, of which claims 6 and 7 are independent.

Claims 6-7 have been amended. No claims have been added or canceled in this amendment. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

### **Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 6 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,218,305 issued to *Nose* (hereinafter “Nose”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

A complete discussion of the Examiner's rejection is set forth in the Office Action, and is not repeated here.

As presently amended, claim 6 (and claim 7 similarly) recites, in part:

a voltage varying device that varies, in accordance with the input image data and according to one of the modes for driving the liquid crystal display panel, a gradation voltage applied to the liquid crystal display panel and corresponding to the image data, so as to prevent changes in gamma characteristics due to differences in response speed of liquid crystal between display gradations, which differences are caused by insertion of the monochrome display data.

The Office Action asserts that these feature are disclosed by Nose. In particular, the Office Action asserts Figs 10 and 12, column 10, lines 14-47 and column 12, lines 1-34 of that reference as disclosing the voltage varying device.

Nose discloses an LCD controller 42 which receives gradation data D10, synchronism data D11, and an “image discriminating signal” J1, where the image discriminating signal J1 “indicates a dynamic image” or “shows a static image”. See col. 9, lines 24-28; col. 9, lines 38 and 43. “The LCD controller 42 controls the signal line driving circuit 46 and a scanning line driving circuit 48, to define whether a black display is performed or not.” Col. 9, lines 13-15. Presumably, the Examiner believes that the “black display” disclosed by Nose is merely one of several gradation voltage levels from which image gradations are “varied” by the LCD controller. However, even if this interpretation were accurate, Nose provides no indication that a

gradation voltage is varied “to prevent changes in gamma characteristics due to differences in response speed of liquid crystal between display gradations, which differences are *caused by insertion of the monochrome display data*.” (Claims 6, 7; emphasis added.) One of ordinary skill in the art must logically acknowledge that adopting different voltage for the display of image data, as the Office Action apparently asserts (OA, pages 3-4), does not prevent changes in gamma characteristics due to insertion of monochrome (e.g., black) data.

More specifically, as disclosed by the specification, insertion of monochrome data in an image field may change the gamma characteristics of the resulting image. Varying the gradation voltage of the image data (as separately defined from the monochrome data) is performed to prevent such change in gamma characteristics.

Nevertheless, claims 6 and 7 have been amended to more explicitly recite that which was previously implicit or inherent: that the voltage varied is a gradation voltage corresponding to the image data (as compared with monochrome data). Nose plainly does not anticipate variation of gradation voltage corresponding to the image data “to prevent changes in gamma characteristics due to differences in response speed of liquid crystal between display gradations ... caused by insertion of the monochrome display data.”

Applicants respectfully submit that no matter has been introduced into the claims which was not previously available for search and consideration. Accordingly, it is believed that independent claims 6 and 7 are in condition for allowance without additional search or substantive consideration. Withdrawal of the rejection, favorable reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested. However, should the Examiner find the present claim amendments to require additional search and consideration, Applicants respectfully request a substantive Advisory Action providing guidance indicating which features are believed to be outside the intended invention.

### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 2-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nose in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,084,861 issued to *Iisaka* (hereinafter *Iisaka*”). (The Office Action refers to the reference as “*Lisaka*”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

A complete discussion of the Examiner's rejection is set forth in the Office Action, and is not being repeated here.

Claims 2-5 ultimately depend from claim 6 and are believed to be in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons as their base claim, discussed above. It is respectfully submitted that Iisaka does not remedy the described deficiencies of Nose. Withdrawal of the rejection, and favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited.

### **Conclusion**

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

In view of the above amendment, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact James C. Larsen, Registration No. 58,565 at the telephone number of the undersigned below to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Director is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge any fees required during the pendency of the above-identified application or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448.


Dated: April 14, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By

  
Michael R. Cammarata

Registration No.: 39491

James C. Larsen 

Registration No.: 58565

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road, Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, VA 22040-0747

703-205-8000